

Luke D. Miller
Miller Bradley Law LLC
1567 Edgewater St NW PMB 43
Salem OR 97304
office@millerbradleylaw.com
(503) 967-0074

M.E. Buck Dougherty III
Liberty Justice Center
7500 Rialto Blvd., Suite 1-250
Austin, TX 78735
bdougherty@libertyjusticecenter.org
(512) 481-4400

Of Attorneys for Plaintiff

Karen O’Kasey
Taylor B. Lewis
Zachariah H. Allen
Hart Wagner LLP
1000 SW Broadway, Twentieth Floor
Portland, OR 97205
kok@hartwagner.com
tbl@hartwagner.com
zha@hartwagner.com
(503) 222-4499

*Of Attorneys for Defendants
Lake Oswego School District and
Lake Oswego School Board*

Jonathan M. Radmacher
McEwen Gisvold LLP
1100 SW 6th Avenue, Suite 1600
Portland, OR 97204
jonathanr@mcewengisvold.com
(503) 226-7321

*Of Attorneys for Defendant
Oregon School Activities Association*

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON
PORTLAND DIVISION

JOHN PARKS,

Plaintiff,

v.

**LAKE OSWEGO SCHOOL DISTRICT;
LAKE OSWEGO SCHOOL BOARD;
OREGON SCHOOL ACTIVITIES
ASSOCIATION; PORTLAND PUBLIC
SCHOOLS; and MARSHALL HASKINS,
individually and *in his representative
capacity for OREGON SCHOOL
ACTIVITIES ASSOCIATION and
PORTLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS,***

Defendants.

Case No. 3:24-cv-1198-JR

**RULE 26(F) JOINT REPORT AND
PROPOSED DISCOVERY PLAN**

RULE 26(f) JOINT REPORT AND PROPOSED DISCOVERY PLAN

Pursuant to F.R.C.P. 26(f) and LR 26-1(1), the parties to this case, by and through their respective counsel, jointly submit this Rule 26(f) Report and Proposed Discovery Plan.

///

///

///

///

///

I. Rule 26(f) Conference

Pursuant to F.R.C.P. 26(f) and LR 26-1(1), the parties conferred on January 6, 2025, which was attended by the following attorneys:

M.E. Buck Dougherty III
Liberty Justice Center
7500 Rialto Blvd., Suite 1-250
Austin, TX 78735
bdougherty@libertyjusticecenter.org
(512) 481-4400
Attorneys for Plaintiff

Jonathan M. Radmacher
McEwen Gisvold LLP
1100 SW 6th Avenue, Suite 1600
Portland, OR 97204
jonathanr@mcewengisvold.com
(503) 226-7321
Of Attorneys for Defendant
Oregon School Activities Association

Karen O’Kasey
Taylor B. Lewis
Hart Wagner LLP
1000 SW Broadway, 20th Floor
Portland, OR 97205
kok@hartwagner.com
tbl@hartwagner.com
(503) 222-4499
Attorneys for Defendants
Lake Oswego School District and Lake
Oswego School Board

II. Nature of Discovery and Timeline for Discovery and Pretrial Motions

The conferring parties have agreed to the following proposed discovery plan and timeline for completion of discovery and pretrial motions. Counsel for the OSAA maintains that pursuant to ORS 31.152(2), discovery should be stayed at least with respect to the OSAA, until resolution of the OSAA’s Special Motion to Strike.

a. Rule 26(a) Disclosures and Opening of Discovery (F.R.C.P. 26(f)(3)(A))

Pursuant to LR 26-2, the parties have agreed to forgo the disclosures required by F.R.C.P. 26(a)(1).

b. Anticipated Scope of Discovery (F.R.C.P. 26(F)(3)(B))

In accordance with F.R.C.P. 26(f)(3)(B), the parties agree that discovery will be conducted on the allegations and claims contained within plaintiff's First Amended Complaint and the denials and defenses raised in defendants' Answers. Expert discovery is not expected.

The parties intend to conduct written discovery, including interrogatories, requests for production, and requests for admissions as authorized by the Federal Rules. The parties also intend to conduct depositions.

Anticipated Scope of Plaintiff's Discovery:

Plaintiff currently intends to take written discovery, including, without limitation, interrogatories, requests for production of documents, and requests for admissions, relevant to the factual basis for the allegations and legal theories in the First Amended Complaint. Plaintiff intends to conduct depositions, including, without limitation, agents of defendants and various third parties.

Anticipated Scope of Defendants' Discovery:

Defendants intend to take discovery in accordance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Local Rules, including, without limitation, requests for production of documents, requests for admissions, and interrogatories relevant to the factual basis for the allegations and legal theories in the pleadings. Defendants also intend to conduct depositions, including, without limitation, plaintiff, agents of other co-defendants, and various third parties.

c. Electronically Stored Information (F.R.C.P. 26(f)(3)(C))

In accordance with F.R.C.P. 26(f)(3)(C), the parties have discussed electronically stored information. As guiding principles, the parties agree to meet and confer in good faith concerning issues that arise with respect to the disclosure or discovery of electronically stored information,

and to use their best efforts to produce electronically stored information in the format preferred by the requesting party.

d. Privilege Issues (F.R.C.P. 26(f)(3)(D))

In accordance with F.R.C.P. 26(f)(3)(D), the parties have discussed privilege and protection issues. To the extent a stipulated protective order is later required, the parties will meet and negotiate the terms of the order before filing with the Court.

Pursuant to F.R.C.P. 26(b)(5), the parties are requiring a privilege log for any information that is withheld based on privilege, with the exception of any correspondence solely between counsel of record and their respective clients after the date of the filing of the lawsuit. For any other claim of privilege, claim of confidentiality, or other basis for withholding the information, a privilege log is required.

e. Limitations of Discovery (F.R.C.P. 26(f)(3)(E))

The parties do not currently anticipate exceeding discovery limitations set by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Local Rules and adopt the default limitations imposed by them. The parties reserve the right to seek leave of Court to exceed these discovery limitations if necessary.

f. Other Discovery & Scheduling Orders (F.R.C.P. 26(f)(3)(F))

In accordance with F.R.C.P. 26(f)(3)(F), the parties have discussed the need for other discovery or scheduling orders under Rules 26(c), 16(b), and 16(c). The parties do not currently request any other orders, though they may seek additional orders as discovery proceeds and if the need arises.

///

///

g. Timeframe for Discovery

The parties agree that discovery will be completed by June 27, 2025.

h. Expert Disclosures and Reports

The parties do not anticipate the need for expert discovery.

i. Discovery Plan and Proposed Filing Dates

The parties request and propose the following litigation schedule:

Event	Parties' Proposal
Close of Discovery	June 27, 2025
Filing of Initial Dispositive Motions	July 31, 2025
Joint ADR Report	To be set by the Court
Final Pre-Trial Conference	To be set by the Court
Trial	To be set by the Court

III. Settlement

The parties have not yet discussed settlement or alternative dispute resolution. The parties may do this at a later date.

DATED this 3rd day of February 2025.

Respectfully submitted,
 /s/ Taylor B. Lewis

Karen O'Kasey
 Taylor B. Lewis
 Hart Wagner LLP
 1000 SW Broadway, Twentieth Floor
 Portland, OR 97205

*Of Attorneys for Defendants
 Lake Oswego School District and
 Lake Oswego School Board*

/s/ M.E. Buck Dougherty III

Luke D. Miller
Miller Bradley Law LLC
1567 Edgewater St NW PMB 43
Salem OR 97304

M.E. Buck Dougherty III
Liberty Justice Center
7500 Rialto Blvd., Suite 1-250
Austin, TX 78735

/s/ Jonathan M. Radmacher

Jonathan M. Radmacher
McEwen Gisvold LLP
1100 SW 6th Avenue, Suite 1600
Portland, OR 97204